



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/650,159

08/28/2003

Bradley D. Schweigert

KMC-596

7051

39915

7590

09/06/2006

KARSTEN MANUFACTURING CORPORATION
LEGAL DEPARTMENT
2201 WEST DESERT COVE
PHOENIX, AZ 85029

EXAMINER

HUNTER, ALVIN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3711

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/650,159

Applicant(s)

SCHWEIGERT, BRADLEY D.

Examiner

Alvin A. Hunter

Art Unit

3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6, 8, 11 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/08/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hamburger (USPN 6641487) in view of Currie et al. (US 2002/0193184), Johnson (USPN 5116054) and applicant's admission and Chuzo (JP 02-068080).

Regarding claims 1, 4, 6, and 12, Hamburger discloses a putter club head comprising a club head body having a heel, toe, striking face, and a body axis, a hosel including a leg portion where in the leg portion is configured to accept a shaft along a shaft axis wherein the shaft axis defines a lie angle with respect to the body axis (See Figure 1). Hamburger discloses that the structure of the club head made be made of any material such as metal or plastic in which metal is commonly known to undergo plastic deformation through bending and stretching. If in doubt, Currie discloses a fitting method for a custom made putter wherein the hosel is bent to accommodate the aiming tendencies of the user (See Paragraph 0109). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to plastically deform the hosel, as taught by Currie et al., in order to accommodate the user's aiming tendencies. Johnson also discloses a putter club head wherein the hosel is bent to hide the leg portion out of view of the user (See

Art Unit: 3711

Column 3, lines 28 through 52 and the paragraph bridging columns 3 and 4). Johnson even discloses the top of the hosel being thicker than the lower parts of the hosel so as to place the hosel out of the user's view (See Column 6, lines 21 through 60). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have the hosel thicker at the top and thinner at the bottom in order to improve the user's aiming tendencies.

Johnson does not disclose the angle of the hosel, however, the angle shown by Johnson is disclosed as achieving the same goal as that of the applicant which is to conceal the leg of the hosel for the user's view. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have the hosel of any angle so long as the leg is concealed from the user's view. Hamburger does not explicitly disclose the hosel having a boss. Applicant admits that it is common practice within the art to have a boss attached to the leg portion of a hosel to receive a shaft. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to place a boss on the leg portion of Hamburger in order to facilitate attachment of a shaft. The term "configured" does not require the invention to carry out the intended use; only be capable of carrying out the intended use in which Hamburger achieves. It also should be noted that the hosel is configured such that the body axis is parallel to a playing surface. It should also be noted that applicant notes in the paragraph bridging page 4 and 5 of the instant application that the leg is not limited to having a rectangular cross-section and does not disclose any reason for not having the cross-section of any other shape. Hamburger and Johnson both disclose the leg portion being cylindrical and Johnson discloses the leg portion being thinner than the point of shaft connection. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it

Art Unit: 3711

obvious to have the cross-section of any shape so long as it is concealed from the view of the user. Also, Chuzo disclose a putter having a hosel with a horizontal portion 2 wherein the leg portion of the hosel is rectangular (See Abstract and Figure 3). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have a horizontal portion, as taught by Chuzo, in order to line up the golf club with the target. Also, hosels are known within the art to have different shapes, wherein a rectangular shaped hosels are also known as proven by Chuzo. The leg portion of the hosel of Chuzo supports the horizontal portion as well as inherently provides an aesthetic look to the club head. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have a rectangular leg portion, as taught by Chuzo, in order to support the horizontal portion of the hosel and to improve the aesthetics of the club head.

Claims 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamburger in view of Currie et al. (US 2002/0193184), Johnson (USPN 5116054) applicant's admission, Chuzo (JP 02-068080), and (JP and Jackson (The Modern Guide to Golf Clubmaking)).

Regarding claim 8, Hamburger discloses a putter club head comprising a club head body having a heel, toe, striking face, and a body axis, a hosel including a leg portion where in the leg portion is configured to accept a shaft along a shaft axis wherein the shaft axis defines a lie angle with respect to the body axis (See Figure 1). Hamburger discloses that the structure of the club head made be made of any material such as metal or plastic in which metal is commonly known to undergo plastic deformation through bending and stretching. If in doubt, Currie discloses a fitting

Art Unit: 3711

method for a custom made putter wherein the hosel is bent to accommodate the aiming tendencies of the user (See Paragraph 0109). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to plastically deform the hosel, as taught by Currie et al., in order to accommodate the user's aiming tendencies. Johnson also discloses a putter club head wherein the hosel is bent to hide the leg portion out of view of the user (See Column 3, lines 28 through 52 and the paragraph bridging columns 3 and 4). Johnson even discloses the top of the hosel being thicker than the lower parts of the hosel so as to place the hosel out of the user's view (See Column 6, lines 21 through 60). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have the hosel thicker at the top and thinner at the bottom in order to improve the user's aiming tendencies. Johnson does not disclose the angle of the hosel, however, the angle shown by Johnson is disclosed as achieving the same goal as that of the applicant which is to conceal the leg of the hosel for the user's view. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have the hosel of any angle so long as the leg is concealed from the user's view. Hamburger does not explicitly disclose the hosel having a boss. Applicant admits that it is common practice within the art to have a boss attached to the leg portion of a hosel to receive a shaft. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to place a boss on the leg portion of Hamburger in order to facilitate attachment of a shaft. The term "configured" does not require the invention to carry out the intended use; only be capable of carrying out the intended use in which Hamburger achieves. It also should be noted that the hosel is configured such that the body axis is parallel to a playing surface. It should also be noted that applicant notes in

Art Unit: 3711

the paragraph bridging page 4 and 5 of the instant application that the leg is not limited to having a rectangular cross-section any does not disclose any reason for not having the cross-section of any other shape. Hamburger and Johnson both disclose the leg portion being cylindrical and Johnson discloses the leg portion being thinner than the point of shaft connection. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have the cross-section of any shape so long as it is concealed from the view of the user. Also, Chuzo disclose a putter having a hosel with a horizontal portion 2 wherein the leg portion of the hosel is rectangular (See Abstract and Figure 3). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have a horizontal portion, as taught by Chuzo, in order to line up the golf club with the target. Also, hosels are known within the art to have different shapes, wherein a rectangular shaped hosels are also known as proven by Chuzo. The leg portion of the hosel of Chuzo supports the horizontal portion as well as inherently provides an aesthetic look to the club head. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have a rectangular leg portion, as taught by Chuzo, in order to support the horizontal portion of the hosel and to improve the aesthetics of the club head. Also, Jackson disclose a method for customizing a golf club head comprising providing a golf club head including a club head body having a body axis wherein a shaft or shaft connecting portion is attached to the club head, determining a target lie angle, and adjusting the lie angle to the target lie angle by plastically deformation. Jackson does not explicitly disclose the club having a hosel constructed of a leg portion and boss portion. It should be noted that a forward

Art Unit: 3711

slant is not necessary in order to deform the leg portion and, therefore, could be deformed having any predetermined angle with respect to the body axis.

Regarding claim 11, Jackson does not disclose a specific degree of lie angle change. The degree of the lie is a measurement that varies by user. One having ordinary skill in the art would have drawn from Jackson that the lie angle may be deformed to any angle degree so long as it fits the user's needs.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin A. Hunter whose telephone number is (571) 272-4411. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM Eastern Time.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Kim, can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 3711

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alvin A. Hunter, Jr.


EUGENE KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER